

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/934,521	08/23/2001	Yasushi Isami	TD-US000367	8144
22919	7590 05/02/2005		EXAMINER	
SHINJYU GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP 1233 20TH STREET, NW, SUITE 700			CHARIOUI, MOHAMED	
	N, DC 20036-2680	·	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2857	•
			DATE MAILED: 05/02/2005	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		 	ł			
•	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/934,521	ISAMI, YASUSHI				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	_			
	Mohamed Charioui	2857				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a report of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stature Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	. 136(a). In no event, however, may a repl ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH te, cause the application to become ABAN	y be timely filed 30) days will be considered timely. IS from the mailing date of this communication. IDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 F	February 2005.					
· <u> </u>	<u> </u>					
closed in accordance with the practice under	•	••				
Disposition of Claims						
4)	awn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on 31 October 2003 is/ard		ected to by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ction is required if the drawing(s)	is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	examiner. Note the attached (Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Burea	nts have been received. nts have been received in Apporting the contract of th	olication No				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	t of the certified copies not re	ceived.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Sun	nmary (PTO-413)				
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		Mail Date rmal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 2857

1. Applicant canceled claims 25, 28 and 29.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 10-12, 15-24, 26, 27 and 30-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodman (U.S. 6,616,613) in view of Shen et al. (U.S. 6,709,399)

As per claims 1, 3, 5 and 30-32, Goodman teaches a measurement step of obtaining measurement data by means of a measurement device (i.e. processor means 14) for a subject's in vivo test and/or in vitro test (see col. 4, lines 14-20 and col. 4, lines 34-37), a first transmission step of transmitting the measurement data from the measurement device to an analysis device via a network (see col. 4, lines 5-20), a first receiving step of receiving the measurement data by the analysis device (see col. 4, lines 14-20), an a processing step of processing the measurement data by the analysis device to obtain an analytical result which corresponds to the measurement data (see col. 34, lines 8-41 and col. 4, lines 14-20 and col. 4, lines 34-37), a second transmission step of transmitting the analytical data from the analysis device, via the network, to the measurement device, and a second receiving step of receiving the analytical result by the measurement device (col. 4, lines 13-21).

Goodman fails to teach converting the measurement data into analytical results by the analysis device, wherein analytical result including the subject's in vivo and/or in vitro test results, which is a result of analysis of the measurement data.

Shen et al. teach this feature (see col. 1, line 55 to col. 2, line 30; Abstract; and Fig. 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Shen et al.'s teaching into Goodman's teaching because the measurement data would transmitted to the remote location to be converted into analytical results by the analysis device. Therefore the analytical results would be examined to determine any anomalies in the subject's in vivo and/or in vitro test results and appropriate actions would be taken to cure theses anomalies.

As per claims 2, 4 and 6, Goodman further teaches that the first transmission step includes a step of associating a communication address of said measurement device with said measurement data (see line 60 to col. 34, line 7).

As per claim 7, Goodman further teaches that the receiving means further receives identification information and test items for the subject that are associated with the measurement data, and the transmission means transmits the identification information of the subject and the test items associated with the measurement data (see col. 33, line 60 to col. 34, line 7).

As per claims 10, 15-17, 22-24, 26, 27, 33 and 41, Goodman further teaches receiving means for receiving a measurement data from the measurement device via a network from a measurement device that conducts measurements for a subject's in vivo test and /or in vitro test and obtains the measurement data (see col. 4, lines 1-20),

processing means for processing the measurement data, and obtaining an analytical result which corresponds to the measurement data (see col. 4, lines 1-20 and col. 34, lines 8-41), and transmission means for transmitting, via the network, the analytical result to an output device that outputs the analytical result (col. 4, lines 1-21 and col. 34, lines 8-41).

Goodman fails to teach converting the measurement data into analytical results by the analysis device, wherein analytical result including the subject's in vivo and/or in vitro test results, which is a result of analysis of the measurement data.

Shen et al. teach this feature (see col. 1, line 55 to col. 2, line 30; Abstract; and Fig. 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Shen et al.'s teaching into Goodman's teaching because the measurement data would transmitted to the remote location to be converted into analytical results by the analysis device. Therefore the analytical results would be examined to determine any anomalies in the subject's in vivo and/or in vitro test results and appropriate actions would be taken to cure theses anomalies.

As per claims 11, 18 and 21, Goodman further teaches receiving means receives a communication address of the measurement device and associates said communication address with the measurement data (see col. 33, line 60 to col. 34, line 7).

As per claims 12, 19 and 20, Goodman further teaches that the receiving means further receives identification information and test items for the subject that are associated with the measurement data, and the transmission means transmits the identification information of the subject and the test items associated with the analytical data (see col. 33, line 60 to col. 34, line 7).

As per claims 34-40, Goodman further teaches an analysis device to be connected via a network to the measurement device; wherein the measurement device comprises measurement means for conducting measurements for a subject's in vivo test and/or in vitro test and for obtaining measurement data (see col. 4, lines 1-37), first transmission means for transmitting, via the network, the measurement data to the analysis device (see col. 4, lines 1-20), and the analysis device comprises receiving means for receiving the measurement data from the measurement device via the network (see col. 4, lines 14-20), processing means for processing the measurement data, and obtaining an analytical result which corresponds to the measurement data (see col. 4, lines 1-37 and col. 34, lines 8-41), and second transmission means for transmitting, via the network, the analytical result to the measurement device (see col. 4, lines 1-37).

Goodman fails to teach converting the measurement data into analytical results by the analysis device, wherein analytical result including the subject's in vivo and/or in vitro test results, which is a result of analysis of the measurement data.

Shen et al. teach this feature (see col. 1, line 55 to col. 2, line 30; Abstract; and Fig. 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Shen et al.'s teaching into Goodman's teaching because the measurement data would transmitted to the remote location to be converted into analytical results by the analysis device. Therefore the analytical results

Application/Control Number: 09/934,521 Page 6

Art Unit: 2857

would be examined to determine any anomalies in the subject's in vivo and/or in vitro

test results and appropriate actions would be taken to cure theses anomalies.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 8, 9, 13 and 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base

claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and overcome all the objections

listed in claim objections section above.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject

matter:

Regarding claims 8 and 13, none of the prior art of record teaches or suggests

that the receiving means further receives device identification information that identifies

a class of the measurement device and the measurement data associated therewith.

and selection means for selecting an analysis program corresponding to the class of the

measurement device from amongst the stored analysis programs, and for applying the

selected analysis program to process the measurement data, in combination with the

res of the claim limitations.

Regarding claims 9 and 14, none of the prior art of record teaches or suggests

determination means for determining items billed to the manager of the measurement

device based on the contract conditions and the usage results, in combination with the

rest of the claims limitations.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 10-12, 15-24, 26, 27 and 30-41 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact information

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohamed Charioui whose telephone number is (571) 272-2213. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday, from 9 am to 6 pm.

Art Unit: 2857

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marc S Hoff can be reached on (571) 272-2216. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mohamed Charioui

4/24/05

HALMACHSMAN PRIMARY EXAMINER